

REMARKS**Status of the Claims**

Claims 1-2, 4-10, 12-18, and 20-23 are currently present in the Application, and claims 1, 9, and 17 are independent claims. Claims 1, 6-9, 12, 14-17, and 22-23 have been amended, claims 2, 11, 19, and 24-26 have been cancelled, and no claims have been added. Applicants are not conceding in this Application that those claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, as the present claim amendments and cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of the allowable subject matter noted by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue these and other claims in one or more continuation and/or divisional patent applications.

In particular, Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 9, and 17 to include limitations previously found in dependent claims 2, 11, 19, and have therefore canceled claims 2, 11, 19. In addition, Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 9, and 17 to clarify and more distinctly claim Applicants' invention.

Examiner Interview

Applicants note with appreciation the interview conducted between Applicants' undersigned attorney and the Examiner on November 5, 2007. During the interview, Applicants' attorney and the Examiner discussed how it did not appear that the § 102 reference taught end users making associations between portlets. The Examiner suggested amendments to the independent claims to clarify that an end user, rather than a developer or system administrator, uses the user interface to create the associations. Applicants' attorney and the Examiner further discussed various amendments to the preamble that might be used to address the § 101 rejections.

Drawings

Applicants note with appreciation the acceptance, by the Examiner, of Applicants' original drawings that were submitted concurrently with the application.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 9, 10, and 12-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The rejection avers that these claims are drawn to a computer program product that may include not only recordable-type media, but also transmission-type media. The rejection also states that software-per-se (functional descriptive material only) is non-patentable subject matter. Applicants have amended claim 9 (the independent claim) so that these claims are directed to a "computer-recordable medium encoded with functional descriptive material..." Accordingly, Applicants have overcome the rejection because the claims are now only drawn to "recordable-type media" that the rejection infers is patentable subject matter. In addition, the invention is not drawn to software-per-se in that the claim is directed to computer-recordable medium (e.g., magnetic media, etc.) that is encoded with software (functional descriptive material). Consequently these claims are not drawn to software-per-se and are directed to patentable subject matter.

Claim Rejections - Alleged Anticipation Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-2, 4-10, 12-18, and 20-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,240,280 to Jolley et al. (hereinafter "Jolley"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Independent claims 1, 9, and 17 are method, computer program product, and information handling system claims, respectively, that each include limitations directed to Applicants' invention of allowing an end user to associate a property from a first set of portlets (provider portlets) with a second set of portlets (consumer portlets). Taking claim 1 as an exemplary claim, the limitations include:

- registering one or more portlet actions corresponding to a plurality of for one or more portlets within a portal infrastructure, wherein a first set of one or more of the plurality of portlets are providers of a particular property and wherein a second set of one or more of the plurality of portlets are consumers of the particular property;

- assembling a portal page for presentation in a browser, wherein the portal page includes interfaces from the plurality of one or more portlets; and
- including in the portal page a user interface control associated with [[a]] the particular property, wherein the user interface control, when actuated in a particular manner of actuation by an end user, allows [[a]] the end user to associate the particular property from one or more of the first set of portlets with at least one of the portlets from the second set of portlets one or more portlet actions such that an occurrence of a subsequent event associated with the particular property causes the at least one of the one or more portlet actions to be executed wherein the particular property is provided from the one or more associated first set of portlets to the one or more associated second set of portlets.

As discussed with the Examiner, Applicants have amended the independent claims to clarify and more distinctly claim the subject matter that Applicants consider to be their invention. These amendments include amending "portlets" to be "a plurality" rather than "one or more" as Applicants' invention is directed at communicating "properties" between portlets as directed by an end user. Note that "properties" are defined in Applicants specification (paragraph 39) as "data items produced by, consumed by, stored by, or otherwise associated with a portlet." In addition, the plurality of portlets have been claimed as including two "sets" of portlets. A first set of portlets are "producers" of the property and a second set of portlets are the "consumers" of the property. Applicants further clarified that the "user" is an "end user" and the end user is the person making the association between the producer portlet(s) and the consumer portlet(s). Finally, Applicants' claim amendments clarify that when a subsequent event associated with the particular property occurs, portlet action(s) occur and the particular property is provided from one of the first set (producer) portlets to one or more of the second set of portlets.

The Office Action contends that Jolley teaches each of the limitations set forth in the independent claims. As discussed below, it is plain to see that this is not the case and that Jolley fails to teach each of Applicants' claim limitations.

The Office Action contends that Jolley teaches a method and system of providing interfaces and actions to a portal page (citing the abstract, col. 1, line 1 – col. 4, line 30, and col. 9, line 60 – col. 10, line 5 in support of this contention). A review of Jolley, however, reveals that Jolley teaches a system and method for providing application flow integration in a portal framework. At col. 3, lines 26-28, Jolley explains that a “webflow” is configured at a Web server in order to provide a “tree structure along which the user is guided.” This citation, as well as further passages found throughout the Jolley reference show that Jolley is teaching a system and method for controlling a user's interaction with a portal and particular portlets contained in the portal.

Importantly, Jolley does not teach providing properties from one portlet within a portal to another portlet, as is taught and claimed by Applicants. Instead, the only reference cited in the Office Action for any communication between portlets is in the context of a refresh event where one portlet is maximized or resized and another portlet is resized. At col. 6, lines 42-50 Jolley describes the “refresh event” and how such communication takes place. These resizing signals are simply not analogous nor do they anticipate Applicants' claimed limitation of providing a particular property from one portlet to another portlet based on an event that occurs when an end user actuates a control.

Furthermore, Applicants claim that an interface control is actuated by an end user to associate a property from one of the provider portlets to one or more of the consumer portlets and that the property is thereafter provided from the provider portlet to the consumer portlets upon the occurrence of a subsequent event. Applicants note that nowhere in Jolley does Jolley teach a system or method where an end user makes any associations between portlets nor, as explained above, does Jolley teach or suggest having one portlet provide a property to another portlet regardless of how the portlets were associated.

Therefore, because Jolley does not teach each of the claimed limitations set forth in the independent claims, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections have been overcome and that Applicants' claims as set forth in the independent claims are each allowable over Jolley. In addition, claims 2, 4-8, 10, 12-16, 18, and 20-23 each depend, either directly or indirectly, on one of the independent claims and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that the independent claims are allowable.

Conclusion

As a result of the foregoing, it is asserted by Applicants that the remaining claims in the Application are in condition for allowance, and Applicants respectfully request an early allowance of such claims.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact the Applicants' attorney listed below if the Examiner believes that such a discussion would be helpful in resolving any remaining questions or issues related to this Application.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Joseph T. Van Leeuwen, Reg. No. 44,383/
Joseph T. Van Leeuwen, Reg. No. 44,383
Van Leeuwen & Van Leeuwen
Attorneys for Applicant
Telephone: (512) 301-6738
Facsimile: (512) 301-6742